



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,212	10/08/2003	Jurgen Lappohn	LAPPOHN - 4	8089
25889	7590	06/22/2005		EXAMINER
WILLIAM COLLARD COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD ROSLYN, NY 11576			VU, HIEN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/682,212	LAPPOHN, JURGEN
	Examiner Hien D. Vu	Art Unit 2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 6-10 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 6-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claim 1, lines 21-22 the feature "a plurality of additional ...of the shielding plate" and claim 6 features must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to

comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: page 9, lines 15, 17 and 18, the term of element 5 are still not consistent, page 11, line 20 and page 12, line 13, the term of elements 18 are not consistent. Applicant is required to review the entire disclosure and make corrections where necessary.

3. The specification is objected to because elements in page 9 & 12, the term of the elements 18, 18', 19 and 19' have been used more than one time and they are confusing and unclear, for example, it is unclear how the elements can be shown for both contact holes and bushings. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 1-2 and 6-10 are objected to because in claim 1, lines 21-22, it is unclear how the first segment of the shielding plate could have a plurality of additional catch devices since they are not clearly shown in the drawings. Claim 6 features are unclear as to how the body could have positioning projections interacted with corresponding positioning recess on the shielding plate since they are not clearly shown in the drawings. Claim 8, line 18, "the corpus" lacks an antecedent basis.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al (076) in view of Casey (646) and Brown et al (329).

Insofar as the claims can be understood, Cohen, Figs. 1, 4 & 8 show a terminal strip plug-in connector 120, insulative housing 138 is read as the recited block shaped body, a plurality contacts 144 arranged in the block shaped body, an electrical shielding 142 surrounding the contacts, the shielding 142 having at least one shielding plate arranged on the body on two sides (not labeled), the shielding having a first segment and a second segment (not labeled), at least one recess 162a in the shielding plate, the at least one recess being disposed on the second segment of the shielding plate, at least one catch hook 158 integrally formed on a corresponding side of said body, the at least one catch hook and the at least one recess interact as a catch connection, and a plurality of additional catch devices 162 formed on the first segment of the shielding plate. Cohen does not show the shielding plate having a weakening formed from a thinner section and the weakening disposed in the region of a bending site of the shielding plate. Casey fig. 4 shows a shielding plate (30, 34) having a weakening (not labeled) formed from a thinner section and the weakening disposed in a region of a bending site of the shielding plate. It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Cohen by forming the shielding plate with a weakening as described above, as taught by Casey, in order to allow easier bending the shielding plate.

As to claim 1, the weakening is arranged on an inside of the bending site.

As to claim 6, positioning projections 158 on the body, the positioning projections interacting with corresponding positioning recesses 162a on the shielding plate.

As to claim 7, the body is made of plastic.

As to claims 8, the claim recited method steps substantially corresponding to the connector claim 1, therefore, it is rejected under the similar rationale.

As to claims 9-10, Casey does not show the connector being positioned on a circuit board and the shielding plate with a free end passing through the circuit board and is anchor in place, however, such features are old and well known in the art as shown in Brown (329), therefore to provide such features on the connector of Casey would have been obvious to retain the shield plate and the connector body to a circuit board.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 and 6-10 are have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hein D. Vu at telephone number (571) 272-2016.

Vu/ds

06/04/05



HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER